

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a Non-Final Office action dated May 18, 2006. Claims 1-29 were examined. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-12, 14-25, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rimhagen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,594,245, (hereinafter, “Rimhagen”) in view of Repice et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0061522 (hereinafter, “Repice”).

The Office rejects all of the independent claims based on the following assertions:

1) Rimhagen discloses GSM. The Office then states that “GSM systems monitor time periods corresponding to delay between transmission by mobile station and receipt of the transmissions for purposes of time out” (although no particular reference is cited as support for the assertion by the Office).

2) Repice discloses compensating.

The first assertion lacks support from any reference identified by the Office, and the second assertion by the Office is mistaken. Repice discloses a control interface measuring propagation delay over multiple buses to each radio head in a chain of radio heads. The measured propagation delay is then organized into a table and supplied to regional processors at each of the radio heads. Repice discloses a regional processor then selecting a bus to use for the corresponding radio head based on the measured propagation delay. **Repice discloses measuring propagation delay and then selecting a bus based on the measuring.**

Claim 1 recites “compensating for a fixed delay...in evaluating a time period corresponding to a variable delay between transmission of by a mobile and receipt of the transmission by the centralized processing portion.” Claims 15 and 27 recite similar limitations. Repice fails to disclose or suggest compensating for a fixed delay in evaluating a time period corresponding to a variable delay. **Disclosing measuring and selecting as in Repice does not disclose or suggest compensating for a fixed delay as recited in the independent claims.**

The contrast becomes clearer with reference to dependent claims 4, 5, 20, and 21. Claim 4 recites “subtracting out the fixed delay in a calculation of the time period corresponding to the variable delay.” The rationale for rejecting claim 4 is the Office’s assumption, which is unsupported, that selecting a bus with shortest propagation delay involves subtracting out longer delays. The assumption by the Office severely contorts the actual disclosure of Repice, which discloses selecting a bus based on shortest propagation delay.

Claim 5 recites “increasing a first time period corresponding to receipt of the transmission at the one of the remote air interface radio portions, by a second time period corresponding to the fixed delay.” The Office supports this rejection based on col. 6, lines 18 – 20 of Rimhagen. Rimhagen discloses synchronizing base stations to transmit a packet P3 two time slots behind a packet P2. Rimhagen does not disclose or suggest increasing a time period that corresponds to transmission at a remote air interface by a second time period, which corresponds to a fixed delay.

Claim 20 recites “adding the fixed delay to the allowable time out period and comparing to the time interval.” The Office again refers to Rimhagen’s disclosure of synchronizing base stations so that successive time slots are not necessarily employed for transmission of packets. *See* Rimhagen col. 6, lines 13 – 20. Synchronizing base stations for non-successive time slots does not disclose or suggest comparing a time interval to a sum of a fixed delay and an allowable timeout to determine if a call times out.

Claim 21 recites “subtracting the fixed delay from the time interval and comparing to the allowable time out period.” The Office relies on Repice’s disclosure of selecting a shortest propagation delay. Selecting a shortest propagation delay does not disclose or suggest comparing an allowable time out period to a time interval reduced by a fixed delay.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the claims are disclosed or suggested by any of the art of record for at least the reasons above.

Claims 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rimhagen in view of Repice, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,427,075 granted to Burg, et al. (hereinafter, “Burg”). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 13 and 26 are

allowable at least because they depend from corresponding ones of the above allowable independent claims.

Conclusion

In summary, claims 1-29 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

- ☐ deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.
- ☐ facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.

Date

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Gilliam, Reg. No. 51,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6320 (direct)
(512) 338-6300 (main)
(512) 338-6301 (fax)